

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1, 3-10, 12-20, 28-34, and 36 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 12, 28, and 36 have been amended. Support for the claim amendments is found on page 14, paragraph [0038] of the instant specification. Claims 1, 3-10, 12-20, 28-34, and 36 presently stand rejected.

### **Telephone Conversation With Examiners**

Examiner Pan and Examiner Truong are thanked for the telephone conversation conducted on June 25, 2008. Proposed claim amendments were discussed. The teachings of the cited art were discussed. No agreements were reached.

### **Regarding the Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 1, 3-10, 12-20, 28-34 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Juels et al. (US Patent No. 7,197,639, hereinafter “Juels”) in view of Landsman et al. (US Patent Pub. No. 2005/0055410, hereinafter “Landsman”). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Juels and Landsman, whether considered separately or in combination, neither disclose nor suggest “communicatively coupling a cancellation server to at least one database comprising a plurality of unique identifiers for cryptographic puzzles” as recited in claims 1, 12, and 36, nor “communicatively connecting to at least one database comprising a plurality of unique identifiers for cryptographic puzzles” as recited in claim 28.

Juels relates to cryptographic communications methods and systems that protect a server from a connection depletion attack. Landsman relates to managing electronic messages and computer systems sending one, two, or more challenge messages to the sender of the electronic messages in determining whether to deliver an electronic message.

The Office Action asserts that Juels teaches a cancellation server communicatively coupled to at least one database, however, it does not. The Office Action looks to Landsman for a disclosure of a database use, however, Landsman does not provide the remedy for the lack of disclosure in Juels.

Juels teaches away from the use of a database for submitting or solving cryptographic puzzles, or maintaining any information concerning the validation of users at all. In Col 16, lines 41-48 Juels discloses “it is desirable that the server 120 be able to verify, via the computational task solution verifier 150 (FIG. 1), *without the use of a database containing puzzle imposition history data*, or any other data, that a puzzle solution presented by a client” (emphasis added) and, in lines 50-52 that “This mechanism can also be referred to as a “stateless, memory less or history less” method of the server 120 to process the return of previously imposed puzzles.” Thus, not only does Juels not disclose or suggest that it is desirable to couple a cancellation server with a database containing previously available puzzle information, Juels teaches away from this concept and toward a concept that only real-time, stateless, ad hoc cryptographic puzzle solutions are adequate to insure the security of the messages to be sent. Thus, Juels does not disclose the subject matter of claims 1, 12, 28, and 36, and Juels teaches away from the subject matter of claims 1, 12, 28, and 3.

Combining Landsman with Juels does not cure the deficiencies of Juels. Landsman discloses “a challenge generation module 48 of a challenge module 42 of the recipient server 16 may determine whether the sender is designated in a sender database 56 as being authorized (or unauthorized) to send electronic messages to the recipient” as the use of a database. This is completely different from a cancellation server coupled to a database that is used *by the recipient* (emphasis added) to verify that data security of an incoming message has not been violated. Therefore, Landsman does not provide the disclosure to remedy the lack of teaching in Juels for the claim features as recited in claims 1, 12, 28, and 36. Thus, the combination of Juels and Landsman does not provide the teaching to render claims 1, 12, 28 and 36 obvious.

**DOCKET NO.:** MSFT-5310/307233.01  
**Application No.:** 10/806,020  
**Office Action Dated:** April 30, 2008

**PATENT**

Claims 3-10, 13-20, and 29-34 all depend, either directly or indirectly, from one of claims 1, 12, and 28. As such, the applicants submit that these claims are patentable over the combination of the Juels and Landsman references for at least the same reasons as stated above with respect to claims 1, 12, and 28. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

**DOCKET NO.:** MSFT-5310/307233.01  
**Application No.:** 10/806,020  
**Office Action Dated:** April 30, 2008

**PATENT**

### **CONCLUSION**

For the forgoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and early allowance is hereby respectfully requested.

Date: July 29, 2008

**/Joseph F. Oriti/**  
Joseph F. Oriti  
Registration No. 47,835

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
Cira Centre  
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439